

REMARKS

Claims 2, 3 and 7 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 2, 3 and 7 are amended into independent form and claims 1, 4-6, 8 and 9 are cancelled.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiners Dinh and Zhong during the November 9, 2005 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

Claims 1, 2 and 4-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Applicants' Admitted Related Art (AARA) in view of Deering, RFC 966. Applicants note that Applicants' specification discusses related art, not prior art. Applicants' specification does not admit that the background information is prior art. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

AARA and Deering fail to disclose or suggest an IP address setting device with a request packet transmitting unit that transmits a request packet to a particular multicast address, the request packet requesting transmission of MAC addresses from nodes of the network, and a setting packet transmission unit that transmits a setting packet to the particular multicast address, the setting packet including address information set by an address information designation unit and the MAC address included in a response of a corresponding node, as recited in claim 2 as similarity recited in claim 7.

As admitted on page 2 of the Office Action, AARA (Fig. 1) fails to use a multicast address. AARA thus suffers deficiencies as identified on page 2, lines 17-23 of Applicants' specification. In particular, routers set up in AARA's network environment do not allow broadcasted packets to pass through the router. The method in AARA thus cannot be used to set an IP address to a network device located on the other side of the router. In other words, AARA cannot communicate with all of the network devices within the network. The combination of features recited in claims 2 and 7 overcomes the deficiencies of AARA by allowing a setting packet (that includes address information and the MAC address) to be sent

to all of the network devices (nodes of the network) by transmitting a setting packet to a particular multicast address.

AARA fails to provide any disclosure, suggestion or motivation with regard to using a multicast address. Deering also fails to provide any disclosure, suggestion or motivation with regard to using a multicast in the structure specific to AARA.

Deering discusses a multicast extension to the Internet protocol. Deering uses a multicast in order to transmit datagram packets to a set of zero or more destination hosts in a network or inter-network, with a single address specifying the set of destination hosts. Deering uses the multicast in order to transmit to a specific set of hosts rather than a broadcast that transmits to all hosts.

Deering fails to provide any disclosure, suggestion or motivation with regard to using a multicast in the structure of AARA. Deering attempts to restrict a transmission to all of the hosts (and thus reduce overhead and network latency) by using a multicast because a broadcast communicates with all hosts. Deering fails to provide any disclosure with regard to using a multicast address in order to send address information and the MAC address to all of the network devices (nodes of the network) of a particular multicast address. Deering also fails to identify the problems associated with the structure specific to AARA and solved by using a multicast address (as recited in claims 2 and 7) in order to send address information and the MAC address to all of the network devices of a particular multicast address as discussed in Applicants' specification. Accordingly, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use Deering's multicast in the structure specific to AARA.

As discussed during the personal interview, Deering identifies an advantage associated with using a multicast instead of a broadcast (avoiding communication with all hosts). However, avoiding communication is not a problem associated with AARA. AARA's deficiency is in that AARA cannot communicate with all of the network devices within the

network. Accordingly, the motivation to use the multicast in Deering does not apply to AARA and thus one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to use the multicast as suggested by Deering.

Additionally, for claims 2 and 7, AARA shows a display that inputs the address information by operating input buttons of the device. Thus, the display of claims 2 and 7 is different in function from the display of AARA. Additionally, AARA fails to disclose the selection unit of claims 2 and 7.

It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) (and presumably not 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as set forth in the Office Action) over AARA in view of Deering and Boucher et al. (Boucher), U.S. Patent No. 6,434,620. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Boucher fails to overcome the deficiencies of AARA and Deering in disclosing or suggesting an IP address setting device with a request packet transmitting unit that transmits a request packet to a particular multicast address, the request packet requesting transmission of MAC addresses from nodes of the network, and a setting packet transmission unit that transmits a setting packet to the particular multicast address, the setting packet including address information set by an address information designation unit and the MAC address included in a message of a corresponding node, as recited in claim 3. Furthermore, col. 56, lines 51-63 of Boucher fails to disclose the display of claim 3. Accordingly, none of the applied references disclose or suggest all of the features recited in claim 3. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Scott M. Schulte
Registration No. 44,325

JAO:SMS/sxb

Attachment:

Petition for Extension of Time

Date: December 5, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--